1	reviewed the parties' proposed orders in the alternative, and being fully advised in premise,
2	the Court enters the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order.
3	I. FINDINGS OF FACT
4	1.1 In 1988, voters approved Initiative 97. Initiative 97 created the Model Toxics
5	Control Act (MTCA) which governs the investigation and cleanup of contaminated properties
6	within the State. Initiative 97 also created the Hazardous Substance Tax to fund the
7	implementation of MTCA. The Tax is codified at RCW 82.21.
8	1.2 The Hazardous Substance Tax is imposed on the first in-state possession of a
9	hazardous substance within the state (including gasoline and other motor vehicle fuels) at a rate
10	of 0.7 percent multiplied by the wholesale value of the substance.
11	1.3 In 1944, voters approved Amendment 18 to the Washington Constitution (const.
12	art. 11, § 40). Amendment 18 requires that certain revenues be deposited into the Motor
13	Vehicle Fund and used for highway purposes.
- 1	
14	II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
14 15	II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW 2.1 There are no disputed issues of material fact.
15	2.1 There are no disputed issues of material fact.
15 16	 2.1 There are no disputed issues of material fact. 2.2 AUTO has the burden of establishing that the deposit of Hazardous Substance
15 16 17	2.1 There are no disputed issues of material fact. 2.2 AUTO has the burden of establishing that the deposit of Hazardous Substance Tax revenues applicable to motor vehicle fuel into the State Toxics Control Account and the
15 16 17 18	2.1 There are no disputed issues of material fact. 2.2 AUTO has the burden of establishing that the deposit of Hazardous Substance Tax revenues applicable to motor vehicle fuel into the State Toxics Control Account and the Local Toxics Control Account and use of such revenues to prevent and remediate hazardous
15 16 17 18 19	2.1 There are no disputed issues of material fact. 2.2 AUTO has the burden of establishing that the deposit of Hazardous Substance Tax revenues applicable to motor vehicle fuel into the State Toxics Control Account and the Local Toxics Control Account and use of such revenues to prevent and remediate hazardous substance pollution violates Amendment 18 beyond a reasonable doubt.
15 16 17 18 19 20	2.1 There are no disputed issues of material fact. 2.2 AUTO has the burden of establishing that the deposit of Hazardous Substance Tax revenues applicable to motor vehicle fuel into the State Toxics Control Account and the Local Toxics Control Account and use of such revenues to prevent and remediate hazardous substance pollution violates Amendment 18 beyond a reasonable doubt. 2.3 AUTO's claim was not filed within a reasonable time under the Uniform
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	2.1 There are no disputed issues of material fact. 2.2 AUTO has the burden of establishing that the deposit of Hazardous Substance Tax revenues applicable to motor vehicle fuel into the State Toxics Control Account and the Local Toxics Control Account and use of such revenues to prevent and remediate hazardous substance pollution violates Amendment 18 beyond a reasonable doubt. 2.3 AUTO's claim was not filed within a reasonable time under the Uniform Declaratory Judgments Act (Chapter 7.24 RCW) and/or is otherwise barred by the doctrine of
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	2.1 There are no disputed issues of material fact. 2.2 AUTO has the burden of establishing that the deposit of Hazardous Substance Tax revenues applicable to motor vehicle fuel into the State Toxics Control Account and the Local Toxics Control Account and use of such revenues to prevent and remediate hazardous substance pollution violates Amendment 18 beyond a reasonable doubt. 2.3 AUTO's claim was not filed within a reasonable time under the Uniform Declaratory Judgments Act (Chapter 7.24 RCW) and/or is otherwise barred by the doctrine of laches.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	2.1 There are no disputed issues of material fact. 2.2 AUTO has the burden of establishing that the deposit of Hazardous Substance Tax revenues applicable to motor vehicle fuel into the State Toxics Control Account and the Local Toxics Control Account and use of such revenues to prevent and remediate hazardous substance pollution violates Amendment 18 beyond a reasonable doubt. 2.3 AUTO's claim was not filed within a reasonable time under the Uniform Declaratory Judgments Act (Chapter 7.24 RCW) and/or is otherwise barred by the doctrine of laches. 2.4 Amendment 18 to the Washington Constitution does not require that Hazardous

1	III. ORDER
2	Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Court orders as
3	follows: the State's Motion for Summary Judgment is hereby GRANTED; AUTO's Motion
4	for Summary Judgment is hereby DENIED; this matter is DISMISSED WITH
5	PREJUDICE.
6	DONE IN OPEN COURT THIS 8 day of April , 2011.
7	
8	() aver
9	Judge Cheryl Carey
10	Presented by: Approved as to form:
11	ROBERT M. MCKENNA TALMADGE/FITZPATRICK
12	Attorney General
13	/s/ Kelly T. Wood
14	LAURA J. WATSON, WSBA #28452 KELLY T. WOOD, WSBA # 40067 Assistant Attorneys General PHILIP A. TALMADGE, WSBA #6973 SIDNEY C. TRIBE, WSBA #33160
15	Telephone: (360) 586-6770 18010 Southcenter Parkway Tukwila, WA 98188
16	Fax: (360) 586-6760 (206) 574-6661 Email: Laura. Watson@atg.wa.gov
17	Kelly. Wood@atg.wa.gov Attorneys for Plaintiffs
18	DAVID M. HANKINS, WSBA # 19194 Senior Counsel
19	Telephone: (360) 753-5528
20	Fax: (360) 664-2023 Email: David.Hankins@atg.wa.gov
21	Attorneys for Defendants
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	